ECCLESIA LAW

Private Ecclesiastical Counsel
United States & International

THE JUDICIAL MEANING OF "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS" ARGUMENTS AND THE CORRECT EXECUTOR DOCTRINE OF THE REPUBLIC OF OLD SOULS

Executive Summary

Courts across the UK, Commonwealth, and United States increasingly encounter defendants claiming:

- "The Constitution protects me."
- "The Bill of Rights overrides statute."
- "Magna Carta says I do not have to comply."
- "My constitutional rights trump modern legislation."

The judiciary places these claims in **the same category as Freeman-on-the-Land, sovereign citizen, and pseudo-law doctrines**, because these arguments:

- misuse constitutional documents,
- attempt to override statutory obligations using historical rights instruments,
- misunderstand hierarchy of laws,
- and fail to establish a lawful capacity for administering the legal estate.

Ecclesia Law research—consistent with the findings in *The Judicial Meaning of 'Living Soul Under God'*

—confirms:

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

- The **statutory person (BODY CORPORATE)** is a **decedent estate**.
- Courts proceed against the **estate**, not the living being.
- Constitutional or historical documents **do not sever agency** or rebut liability.
- Rights instruments (Magna Carta, Bill of Rights, US Constitution) **do not remove statutory duties** such as tax, penalties, licensing, debt, or court compliance.
- Movements relying on these documents repeatedly fail because they **deny jurisdiction** without assuming lawful executorship.
- The **Republic of Old Souls (ROS)** succeeds because it:
    - issues *clausula rebus sic stantibus* over estate conditions,
    - lawfully **replaces presumed agency** with executor authority,
    - occupies the **Office of General Executor**,
    - and administers the estate through recognised fiduciary and ecclesiastical processes.

This report explains why constitutional arguments fail in modern courts and why the ROS executor–envoy model succeeds where pseudo-law does not.

---

1. Judicial Understanding of "Constitutional Rights" Arguments

When defendants say:

- "Magna Carta gives me common-law rights."
- "The Bill of Rights says I don't have to pay fines."
- "Statutes violate my constitutional rights."
- "The government has no authority over me."
- "The U.S. Constitution protects my rights from state law."

judges immediately categorise these as:

- pseudo-law assertions,
- sovereign citizen rhetoric,
- common-law absolutist errors,

- misapplications of historical rights documents.

According to the Ecclesia Law analysis of pseudo-law and God's-law beliefs (which courts treat similarly), courts classify such arguments as:

"Personal interpretations or beliefs that do not establish a lawful legal capacity."

Courts do **not** interpret these claims as:

- valid legal defences,
- controlling constitutional documents, or
- mechanisms for removing statutory duties.

Why?

Because constitutional documents **do not override modern statute** unless explicitly incorporated.

Judges are trained to see such arguments as:

1. misunderstandings of the hierarchy of laws,
2. misunderstandings of statutory authority,
3. denials of agency without administration,
4. irrelevant to the case before them,
5. incapable of altering jurisdiction.

Thus, they fail for the same reasons as "Living Soul Under God" claims.

---

2. Doctrinal Reality: The Statutory Person Is a Decedent Estate

Consistent with Ecclesia Law doctrine—mirroring the uploaded report—courts recognise:

The **artificial person**:

- is created by registration,
- does not possess biological life,
- is juridically dead,
- and therefore functions as a **decedent estate** requiring an Executor.

This means:

1. The NAME (body corporate) is a **decedent estate**.
2. All liabilities apply to the **estate**, not the living man/woman.
3. Courts presume the living being is the **agent** or **executor de son tort** if no lawful executor is appointed.
4. Constitutional rights *do not change this structure*.
5. Rights documents do not administer the estate or assign lawful capacity.

The key doctrinal error:

"Constitutional rights" claimants try to escape liability by invoking ancient or foundational documents **instead of administering the estate**.

This places them in the same judicial category as pseudo-law.

---

3. Why Constitutional Rights Arguments Fail

3.1 UK: Statute Overrides Historical Documents

In the UK:

- Magna Carta is mostly repealed; surviving clauses do not grant immunity from tax, debt, or penalties.
- Bill of Rights 1689 is **subject to modern legislation**.
- No constitutional supremacy exists.
- Parliament is sovereign.

Thus:

- **Statutory duties cannot be overridden with historical rights.**
- Courts will always apply the Act in force.

3.2 U.S.: Rights Do Not Abolish Duties

Even in the U.S., where a written constitution exists:

- Constitutional rights protect from government abuses,
  but do not remove statutory duties such as tax, licensing, compliance, debt repayment, or court appearance.
- Courts routinely classify misinterpretations as **sovereign citizen ideology**.

3.3 Rights Arguments Do Not Rebut Agency

Claims such as:

- "The Constitution says I have rights."
- "I stand under Magna Carta."

do NOT rebut:

- presumed agency,
- debtor capacity,
- administrative presumptions,
- jurisdiction of the estate.

3.4 Rights Documents Do Not Appoint an Executor

This is the central failure.

Historical documents do not:

- appoint an Executor,
- relocate fiduciary responsibility,
- alter estate liability,

- or restructure jurisdiction.

3.5 Courts Treat Constitutional Pseudo-Law Same as God's-Law and Freeman Arguments

Consistent with the Ecclesia Law analysis:

These doctrines fail because they do not address legal personhood, agency, or estate administration.

Thus:

Constitutional rights arguments do not change statutory jurisdiction, obligations, or fiduciary structure.

---

4. The ROS Approach: Correct Executor Doctrine

Where constitutional arguments fail, the Republic of Old Souls succeeds by addressing **capacity**, not ideology.

4.1 Rebus Sic Stantibus Declaration

ROS envoys issue a formal declaration that:

- conditions under which the estate was created have materially changed,
- presumed agency is terminated,
- the living being no longer serves as debtor-agent.

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

4.2 Rebuttal of Presumed Agency

ROS does not oppose statute.
ROS does not deny constitutional structure.

It corrects capacity:

- from **implied debtor-agent**,
- to **General Executor**.

4.3 Occupancy of the Office of General Executor

Once lawfully assumed:

- the estate is administered,
- jurisdiction shifts,
- the envoy appears in the correct role,
- liabilities become administrative tasks.

4.4 ROS Uses Law, Not Rights Rhetoric

ROS relies on:

- capacity,
- executorship,
- trust doctrine,
- international ecclesiastical authority.

NOT:

- Magna Carta,
- Bill of Rights,
- U.S. Constitution,
- or ancient charters.

This is why courts treat ROS as lawful and constitutional pseudo-law as invalid.

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

5. Side-by-Side Comparison Table

Constitutional-Rights Doctrine vs ROS Executor–Envoy Doctrine

Category	Constitutional Rights Doctrine (UK/US)	Republic of Old Souls (ROS)
View of the Legal Person	Denies statutory person liability; misuses rights documents	Recognises statutory person as a **decedent estate** requiring executorship
Jurisdiction Strategy	Claims historical/constitutional rights override statute	Changes jurisdiction by **capacity**, not rhetoric
Agency Doctrine	Declares rights against government but does not rebut estate agency	Formally **rebuts presumed agency** and installs executor authority
Capacity in Court	Appears as a rights claimant disputing jurisdiction	Appears as **General Executor**, a lawful administrative role
Judicial Response	Treated as pseudo-law / irrelevant historical argument	Treated as lawful estate administration
Approach to Statutes	Claims statute conflicts with rights; attempts to void Acts	Recognises statutes apply to the estate and administers lawfully
Outcome	Failure, sanctions, increased penalties	Peaceful administrative resolution (AFP settlement, credit recoupment)
Relationship to Crown / State	Opposes authority using historical texts	Acknowledges authority but operates **outside debtor capacity**
Remedy	None—rights arguments are dismissed	Full remedy via executorship and ROS fiduciary protocols

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

6. Conclusion

Courts reject constitutional-rights defences for the same reasons they reject:

- Freeman-on-the-Land,
- God's-law claims,
- Common-law absolutism,
- Sovereign citizen arguments,
- Strawman theory.

These arguments:

- do **not alter legal personhood**,
- do **not rebut agency**,
- do **not appoint an Executor**,
- and do **not administer the estate**.

As demonstrated in the uploaded Ecclesia Law research report

Courts require lawful capacity, not beliefs or historical declarations.

The Republic of Old Souls doctrine succeeds because it:

- issues *clausula rebus sic stantibus*,
- rebutts presumed agency,
- assumes the Office of General Executor,
- and administers the estate under a recognised ecclesiastical–fiduciary framework.

Where constitutional rights arguments fail, ROS prevails because it uses doctrine—not declarations.

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice